

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-4, 6-7, and 10-14 remain in the application. Claims 1, 6, and 12-14 have been amended. Claims 5 and 8-9 have been cancelled.

In deference to the requirement in the second paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, an Information Disclosure Statement together with a concise explanation of the relevance is submitted in a separate paper. Consideration of the references listed is, therefore, requested.

In deference to the requirement in the last paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claim 6 has been amended to recite "100 kHz and above," which is clearly supported by the specification.

In deference to the requirement in the second paragraph on page 3 of the above-identified Office action, the specification has been amended to delete the alleged new matter.

In the last paragraph on page 3 of the above-identified Office action, claims 5 and 12-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 5 has been cancelled and claims 12-14 have been amended to recite that the magnetic device is a shielding of a coil, a circuit, and a magnetic disk, respectively.

In deference to the requirement in the first paragraph on page 4 of the above-identified Office action, the phrase "and greater than domains of the grains" has been deleted.

In the second paragraph on page 4 of the above-identified Office action, claims 5 and 12-14 have been rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claim 5 has been cancelled and claims 12-14 have been amended as discussed above.

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's statement in the fifth paragraph on page 4 of the above-mentioned Office action that

claim 1 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the objection set forth in this Office action. Claim 1 has been amended to overcome the objection set forth in this Office action as discussed above.

Applicants also acknowledge the Examiner's statement in the sixth paragraph on page 4 of the above-mentioned Office action that claims 2-4, 6-7, and 10-11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Since claim 1 is believed to be now allowable as discussed above and claims 2-4, 6-7, and 10-11 are dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable in dependent form. A rewrite is therefore believed to be unnecessary at this time.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-4, 6-7, and 10-14 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out. In the alternative, the entry of the amendment is requested as it is believed to place the application in better condition


Applic. No.: 10/626,944  
Amdt. Dated August 3, 2005  
Reply to Office action of January 18, 2005

for appeal, without requiring extension of the field of search.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made. Please charge any fees which might be due with respect to 37 CFR Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

**Yonghong Chen**  
**Reg. No. 56,150**

  
For Applicants

YC

August 3, 2005

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.  
Post Office Box 2480  
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480  
Tel: (954) 925-1100  
Fax: (954) 925-1101